

## Summary of All-Staff Meeting Evaluation Responses

On August 24, 2005, the All-Staff Meeting sessions were held at the Department of Technology Services (DTS) Training Center to discuss the consolidation effort. At the three one-hour sessions, attendees were asked to complete a one-page evaluation form to provide their feedback regarding the meeting. A total of 225 surveys were completed and the following is a summary of survey responses.

### 1.0 Survey Questions

From the nine questions included in the survey, the first two asked participants to identify:

1. Their campus
2. Whether their classification was manager/supervisor or staff

The next three questions asked participants to rate the following statements on a scale of 1 to 10:

3. If the information presented was relevant
4. Whether they felt their questions were answered
5. If they were confident about the consolidation

The final three questions were open-ended and solicited a written response:

6. What did they find most useful about the session?
7. What was the least useful?
8. Did they learn anything that surprised them?
9. Were there other topics they wanted to hear about?

### 2.0 Quantitative Results

#### 2.1 Campus and Classification Level Questions

The following table represents responses to the questions of campus and classification level. The results shown use percentages based on the total 225 surveys completed.

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Percentage</b> (Based on 225 surveys)
Cannery	45.77%
Gold Camp	48.44%
Sequoia Pacific	3.56%
Did not indicate	2.23%
<b>Staff Level</b>	
Manager/Supervisor	20.00%
Staff	72.44%
Future Staff	0.44%
Did not indicate	7.12%

## 2.2 Scale of 1 to 10 Questions

The following table represents responses to the questions based on a scale of 1 to 10 (with 1 being “strongly agree” and 10 being “strongly disagree”):

Question	Average Response	Highest Response	Lowest Response	Did Not Indicate (Percentage based on 225 surveys)
Questions answered?	4.26	1	10	12.89%
Information relevant?	3.75	1	10	2.20%
Confident about consolidation?	4.66	1	10	4.40%

## 2.3 Open-Ended Questions

The following table represents the response rate to the four open-ended questions:

Question	Percentage that Responded to Question (Based on 225 surveys)
What did you find most useful about the session?	67.1%
What did you find least useful about the session?	56.0%
Did you learn anything that surprised you?	68.0%
What other topics would you like to hear about?	69.3%

## 3.0 Qualitative Results

The majority of those surveyed responded to the last four, open-ended questions which solicited their opinions in a written-response format. Highlights and discussion of the responses are included below.

### What did you find *most* useful about the session?

*“The session itself builds cohesion as DTS”*

*“The information about site relocation and the openness of the director to share information.”*

*“The informal Q&A; the desire by management to communicate all information”*

The question and answer period was, by far, the most positively received part of the meetings. Staff appreciated the ability to ask questions and get honest answers. Overall, participants had favorable views of the speakers, and felt they openly and honestly answered the questions.

Other comments regarding what was most useful included simply receiving information about the progress and potential future plans of consolidation. Many appreciated having the face-to-face time with the Director and the Consolidation Management Office (CMO) staff and expressed optimism that improved communication would continue.

### **What did you find *least* useful about the session?**

*"The information about merging processes between now and June 30."*

*"Vague responses. Responses not specifically answering questions."*

*"Nothing, I'm new to DTS and all info. was useful."*

A significant percentage of participants said they felt any and all information was useful, so they had no answer to this question. Others said that the information presented in the meeting had already been provided in the CMO bulletin and, therefore, they did not find it useful. Others wanted answers to questions asked, rather than "we don't know". Also, some staff did not feel there was much use to report on what had already happened (i.e., discussion of the Day One activities) and wanted more new information presented. In addition, several of the comments stated that they did not appreciate the "them versus us" mentality of comparisons between Gold Camp and Cannery campuses.

### **Did you learn anything that surprised you?**

*"No real surprises, just very good info. of status and what to look to in the future."*

*"Divisions are already planning an integrated organization – Human Resources has not been involved in any discussions."*

*"That staff are not providing input; most decisions are made by Executives."*

In general, most employees did not find the information presented to be surprising. Some were unaware that the facility lease for the Cannery is expiring and that the building would eventually be closed. Others did not know that certain staff would be moved to another location. Several employees mentioned they were favorably surprised by the Director's approachability and openness, and by the potential for telecommuting.

### **Are there other topics you would like to hear about?**

*"It would have been nice if key players would have been introduced along with their functions/roles in the consolidation."*

*"Classification issues. When groups are working together doing the same function at different classifications - Has Human Resources been involved?"*

*"What is the feedback loop for staff regarding reengineering aspects? Ownership is key to a successful implementation. What is the future for DTS: Will the consolidation of technology resources continue to shift towards DTS from other depts... such as Caltrans, and other departments? If so, how will this impact the concept of Gold Camp as the primary technical campus?"*

The most requested information was regarding position classifications, pay and staff levels; and the decision-making process used by the campuses in regards to these issues. Participants appear very concerned that one campus or the other is receiving preferential treatment, or that one campus is more involved in the decision-making process for the department. Employees also wanted information on how staff, especially lower-level classifications, could have input in decisions being made and wanted access to a feedback response process for their ideas and concerns. Many mentioned that they wished that CMO executives and other key players from the campuses had been introduced at the meeting, along with a description of the role/function they perform in the consolidation process. Workloads and platforms were also items of concern.